

## The Resurrection of Thomas Paine in American Popular Magazines

TOMMY R. THOMPSON

**T**HOMAS PAINE appeared briefly, albeit brilliantly, on the American historical scene as a patriot during the American Revolutionary era. Probably few individuals realize he arrived in the colonies only in 1774, just as the Revolution was entering its embryonic stage. With a flamboyance perhaps not equalled since, Paine soon after his arrival crystallized the developing revolutionary spirit of the Americans by producing *Common Sense*. This pamphlet was just what the rebellion needed; it spoke to the common people and rallied many to the American cause. During the Revolutionary War Paine added to his luster by producing the series of pamphlets known generally as *The Crisis*. It is questionable whether he ever achieved a greater level of propaganda writing than he did in *The Crisis, No. 1*, proclaiming:

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country, but he that stands it *now* deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. (Conway, *Writings*, I, 170)

With the end of the Revolution, Paine found little purpose to staying in America. In the opinion of Victor F. Calverton, a 20th century editor and author, Paine was a professional revolutionary who now needed a new cause.

Over the next several years, during his stay in England and France, Paine produced two key works, *Rights of Man* and *The Age of Reason*. Both shocked many mem-

bers of society and helped drive a wedge between Paine and America. In *The Age of Reason*, for example, he threatened all traditional Christians when he denied the divine birth of Jesus:

Here, then, is the whole story, foolish as it is, of this child and this virgin . . . priests in later times have applied this story to signify the person they call Jesus Christ, begotten, they say, by a ghost, whom they call holy, on the body of a woman, engaged in marriage, and after married, whom they called a virgin . . . a theory which . . . I hesitate not to disbelieve. (Huett, *Writings*, 166)

By the time he returned to America in 1802, he was known as a political and economic radical and atheist.

Federalists, concerned over losing control of the American government to the “radical” Jeffersonians, labelled Paine a “Loathsome reptile” in their newspapers (Hawke, 45). Also, prior to his return, he bitterly criticized President Washington for “failing” to extricate him from prison in France, where he landed due to the radical turn of events in the revolution there. In America the contributions of Paine to the Revolution were now forgotten. To make matters worse, two of his earliest biographers, Francis Oldys (possibly a pseudonym for George Chalmers, an employee of the British government) in the early 1790s and James Cheetham at the time of Paine’s death in 1809, labelled Paine a drunkard, wife-beater, and habitually filthy individual who refused to leave his bed to fulfill bodily functions. As a result, many years

later, in a biography of Gouverneur Morris, Theodore Roosevelt aptly reflected a majority of the American opinion when he called Paine “a filthy little atheist” (Roosevelt, 251).

It would take decades to resurrect the reputation of Tom Paine after his death. One path taken to accomplish the task was through magazines produced for the general public. In the 180 years since Paine’s death there have not been a tremendous number of articles written about

him, but those that have been published clearly reflect favorable or unfavorable opinions regarding the Revolutionary hero. An examination of these publications shows how Americans slowly reclaimed Paine to some degree as a hero and eventually relied upon him, or at least his words, to support the American way of life, especially in times of crisis.

Some of the earliest articles dealing with Paine continued the negative view which, as noted, was well established by the time of his death. A "Sketch of the Life of Thomas Paine," appearing in *The Spirit of the Pilgrims*, a Boston journal, in 1831, helped set the ideological tone regarding Paine for much of the 19th century. Basically, the "Sketch" amounts to little more than a denunciation of Paine by innuendo. Whether it was his supposed mistreatment of his two wives, his "lack of cleanliness," or his alleged heavy drinking, Paine was guilty according to the author because "it is alleged" by others. But even worse than his personal conduct, was Paine's "Pestiferous publications" which produced "unhappy effects . . . throughout the civilized world" because, in the author's opinion, they denied the right of religion to guide society and attempted to seduce the general "populace" for his "campaign of sedition and blasphemy" ("Sketch," 343). Paine's works had done their damage even though, as the author stresses, he had supposedly repented and cried out on his deathbed for God to help him. Modern historians such as David Hawke and A.J. Ayer reject most of these accusations, but the orthodox of the 19th century, who were offended particularly by Paine's religious views, preferred to believe whatever would sully his reputation.

Just a few years later, in 1843, the *North American Review*, also published in Boston, carried a similar essay on Paine. The author of this piece states that it is now possible to discuss Paine with "entire impartiality." After

all, Paine was a patriot in the Revolution. But throughout the article the author can only condemn Paine for all the sins he committed. As usual, Paine was a drunkard (he was a heavy drinker according to Hawke and others) and wife-abuser, although the latter involved mental and not physical abuse. In addition, nothing really positive can be said about Paine's other activities. *Common Sense* was a "flimsy work" that was successful only because it appeared at precisely the right historical moment, although Paine does draw praise for relating the "oppressive acts" that England forced on the Americans and ended with "the atrocity in the streets of Lexington, the ever memorable 19th of April, 1775" (Alberger, 13-19). The author feels Paine overemphasized his Revolutionary role to a degree of "contemptible exaggeration," a sentiment not accepted by 20th century historians. The author also declares Paine erred in writing both the *Rights of Man* and *The Age of Reason*, the "hornbook of vulgar infidelity" (Alberger, 49). In these works Paine called for a republican form of government for all people and denounced Christian beliefs. Nor did Paine have a true love of virtue or of truth, that is, of religion. In short, he lacked the best quality of human character, "that of the conservative and Christian patriot" (Alberger, 58). All of Paine's ideas, whether religious, political, economic or social, were too radical to be absorbed by pre-Civil War American society.

There was only a weak challenge to these negative opinions of Paine in the years before 1860. In 1859 *The Atlantic Monthly* prepared and published three articles which presented the most balanced treatment of Paine up to that time. These articles ignore the charges of drinking, lack of cleanliness, and mistreatment of his wives. However, the condemnation of Paine's religious beliefs is still present. *The Atlantic Monthly's* editors find *The Age of Reason* "a shallow deistical essay" written in "a most offensive and irreverent style" ("Thomas Paine's

Second Appearance," 16). Also, in the *Rights of Man* Paine espoused radical economic theories, such as pensions for the elderly. Eventually, the only people who remembered him were those who lacked "skill, industry, and thrift," or "Socialists," according to *The Atlantic Monthly*.

On the other hand, the editors of *The Atlantic Monthly* have praise for Paine in several areas. He was a Revolutionary hero who contributed to the cause in a very real way with *Common Sense* and *The Crisis*. More than that, he was part of the democratic movement that was afoot in the 18th century and continued into the 19th. As a man of human instincts and as a political realist, while in France "he took a bold and dangerous" stand by arguing that Louis XVI should not be executed. Paine may have been "coarse and insolent," but this incident proved he was not "cowardly or cruel" ("Thomas Paine in England and France," 702-03). The editors conclude that because of his accomplishments Paine deserved more than the "absolute neglect" he had received.

The Saviors of Thomas Paine, most of whom were liberal religious thinkers, appeared on the American literary scene in the last quarter of the 19th century. Moncure D. Conway, a Unitarian minister, went to the greatest lengths to revitalize Paine's character in numerous articles and a two volume *Life of Thomas Paine* published in 1892. In "The Americanism of Thomas Paine," which appeared in the *Arena* at the end of the century, Conway declares overzealously that Paine was the hero of the Revolution who converted all the American leaders to the cause. Also, Paine spoke against war and slavery and for an American republic which would guarantee freedom and personal rights, especially the right of property and absolute liberty of conscience in religion. Conway could well sympathize with Paine in the latter's view that

if every one is left to judge of its own religion, there is no such thing as a religion that is wrong; but if they are to judge of each other's religion, there is no such thing as religion that is right. (*Rights of Man*, Conway, II, 326)

Conway claims that the enemies of Paine, the "royalists," were to blame for many of his problems. It was Gouverneur Morris, the "treacherous minister" to France who tricked the French government into imprisoning Paine, and who was in league with the royalist governments of Europe in an effort to defeat the French Revolution, views somewhat supported by Hawke and Ayer. Since Paine did not understand Washington was misled by Morris in relation to Paine's imprisonment (Morris claimed he made every effort to secure Paine's release), Paine wrote his accusing and angry letter to the President in which he told Washington that he was "treacherous in private friendship (for so you have been to me, and that in the day of danger) and a hypocrite in public life" and that "the world will be puzzled to decide whether you . . . have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any" ("Letter to George Washington," Conway, III, 252). Even Paine's Revolutionary reputation could not survive such an insulting attack.

Robert G. Ingersoll, known in the late 19th century as "the great agnostic," admired Conway's work on Paine. In an article written in the early nineties for the *North American Review* Ingersoll finds only greatness in Thomas Paine. *Common Sense* was "a purifying flame"; *Rights of Man* "laid the foundation for all the real liberty that the English now enjoy" (186); and his denunciation of slavery and his defense of equal rights for women showed him to be a true humanitarian. As far as Paine's religious beliefs are concerned, Ingersoll declares Paine was simply ahead of his time. According to Ingersoll, the religious concepts he supported were not that unacceptable by the late 1800s, especially his contention that the Bible was

not inspired and could not be read literally. Naturally, the pre-Darwin world of the 18th and early 19th centuries had rejected and condemned such views. If only now the people could understand, Ingersoll stresses, that Paine was not an atheist but an advocate of the rights of each individual to form his own religious beliefs, everyone would appreciate his love for liberty. The greatness of Thomas Paine was that while some people believe in "freedom of religion, he believed in the religion of freedom" (193).

Edward P. Powell was a Unitarian minister, a devotee of *Origin of the Species*, and eventually an associate editor of *Arena*. In a "Study of Thomas Paine," published in that magazine in 1893, Powell tries to make Paine more acceptable to the populace by comparing his religious views with those of Benjamin Franklin. Both men, of course, were Deists who felt the basic purpose of religion was to encourage kindness, charity, mercy, and public spirit. But Franklin was wise enough to refrain from openly attacking traditional Christian beliefs. Also, more in line with previous authors, dating as far back as the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1859, who had begun the rehabilitation of Paine, Powell emphasizes Paine's Revolutionary role. The neglect of the pamphleteer's accomplishment in Powell's eyes was practically a blasphemy on American history. *Common Sense* and *The Crisis* made and saved the War for Independence. Paine's downfall, Powell says, came because he chose to speak for democratic principles in *Rights of Man* and religious free thought in *The Age of Reason*. Aristocrats hated him for the former and Christians for the latter. His enemies then wrote the country's history "to obliterate his fair fame, and children were taught to abhor Tom Paine" (729). Powell's real solace is his belief that the 20th century would finally honor Paine.

By 1900 *The Bookman*, basically a literary magazine, carried an article on "Foreign Authors in America" which

elevated Paine to the status of hero and even a moderate in religious beliefs. Most amazing is the defense of *The Age of Reason*. According to the author, this was an "epoch-making" work which critics wrongly had condemned for a century. Actually, it was so "persistently misquoted and misunderstood," few realized its "tone throughout is noble and reverent" ("Foreign Authors," 498-500). Paine should no longer be considered an enemy to religion since some of his ideas could march side by side with traditional Christian beliefs. Even Conway and his fellow defenders of Paine failed to be so laudatory.

Just a few years later "A Rehabilitation of Thomas Paine," which appeared in *Current Literature*, a broad-scoped magazine covering topics from literature to science, in effect announced that it was acceptable once again to speak favorably of Paine. The author explains that the directors of Independence Hall in Philadelphia had finally allowed a bust of the Revolutionary hero to be placed there; it had been rejected since the 1870s. Although the author does not mention the Progressive Era with its more liberal attitudes as a possible stimulus, he states that the arrival of Paine's statue must indicate a new acceptance of Paine and a growing religious tolerance in America. However, the editors of *The Outlook*, in an almost simultaneous declaration, state to their readers that they had not commented on the centennial of Paine's death partly because they do not admire him. The reason for their omission was his attack on Christianity. To denounce "literalism" was acceptable, but to proclaim the Ten Commandments carry "no internal evidence of divinity with them" was an error Paine should not have made (*The Age of Reason*, Huett, 9).

As America entered World War I, there seemed to be an even greater need to resurrect Thomas Paine. An unsigned article in *The Bookman* in 1918 notes that the Wilson government was using Paine's writing to urge



Americans to buy liberty bonds. Posters shouted that "These are the times that try men's souls." In addition, Paine's comments on the Revolution seemed quite apropos to American involvement in World War I: "It is the object only of war that makes it honorable. And if there was ever a *just* war since the world began, it is this in which America is now engaged" (*The Crisis*, No. 5, Conway, I, 249).

No one did a better job of relating Paine to the war era than did R.C. Roper. In two articles in *The Public* in 1919 Roper claims that as "a builder of republics," Paine was one of the world's greatest democrats. By supporting freedom of action by individuals and nations, he stood for the same principles for which "we went to war against Germany" ("Citizen," 260). Equally important, though, was his call for a "Neighborhood of Nations" to promote free government. Paine may have been writing over one hundred years prior to the outbreak of World War I, but one can well imagine the appeal of his words of peace to those engaged in the morass of a terrible war when he described how Henry IV of France called for "an European Congress . . . who were to act as a Court of arbitration in any disputes that might arise between nation and nation" (*Rights of Man*, Conway, II, 387). Roper urges the members of the Versailles peace conference to heed Paine's ideas. Lastly, Roper also praises Paine for urging the abolition of slavery, equal rights for women, income and inheritance taxes, old age pensions, the education of poor children at public expense, and other reforms. Indeed, the Progressive Era had left its imprint on American society.

In the twenties, as the "Great War" passed, the issue of Paine's religious ideas surfaced once again. "A Knight-Errant of Democracy," appearing in *The Freeman* in 1923, argues that Paine stood for political and religious ideas that would eventually march to "ultimate triumph"

over movements such as the forced Americanism of the reactionary post-war era. Unfortunately, the true age of reason had not yet dawned. Paine may have been a fervent Deist who accepted divine oversight of the universe and moral lessons drawn from nature, but he lost the religious battle because he rejected the Bible as truth. Going further, some authors in the twenties, prodded by the Scopes trial, turned to Paine for an ally against Fundamentalist Protestants. Gilbert Selde, writing in 1927 in *The New Republic*, for which he was a contributing editor, exclaims that American society needs Paine to combat Fundamentalism, to represent intelligence over benighted superstition. However, Selde suggests that Paine's religious opinions should rank second to his defense of political liberty.

On the other hand, the editor of *Catholic World* in the mid-twenties has a difficult time finding Paine's good points. He was a patriot who gave his continual support to the American cause, and he was not an atheist. But in *The Age of Reason* he attacked Christianity "vulgarly and violently" (The Editor, "Tom Paine," 48-49). Also, Paine discussed the Bible "superficially," denounced the Roman Catholic Church unfairly, and described the birth of Jesus in a "blasphemously obscene" manner, the latter of which one may judge by referring to Paine's comment on the subject at the beginning of this paper. The greatest problem, according to this writer, is that Paine proclaimed that "My own mind is my own church" (*The Age of Reason*, Huett, 6). Such a belief is harmful to organized churches and thus civilization. "Fortunately," the editor concludes, "the American people, who trusted Paine's political views, rejected his theological views" (The Editor, "Tom Paine," 57-58).

Amidst this renewed controversy one of the best and most objective articles appeared in *Harper's Monthly Magazine*. Gamaliel Bradford, an American biographer,

in "Damaged Souls" summarizes the conclusions of earlier writers by praising Paine as the Revolutionary propagandist, advocate of democratic principles, and lover of humanity. Bradford's primary contribution, though, is his analysis of Paine as a professional revolutionary. Bradford sees Paine as an individual with a restless nature, a pugnacious willingness to fight for a cause, dedication to his principles, and above all, the desire to attack and destroy ancient and consecrated institutions. To understand Paine, one must see him as he was, someone who "could carry on the merry revel [of revolution] to his heart's content, could smash idols, and grind up crowns, and blast conventions, and turn society topsy turvy." Bradford believes that revolutionaries such as Paine are "occasionally foul-mouthed and slovenly, and often vain, noisy, and altogether distasteful," but they are "the power that moves the world" (378).

The two hundredth anniversary of Paine's birth in 1937 and the advent of World War II combined to produce another series of articles. Victor Calverton, editor of the leftist *Modern Monthly*, in "Thomas Paine God-Intoxicated Revolutionary," provides strong praise for all of Paine's writings. *Common Sense* was "decisive in forcing the Americans to take a revolutionary stand" (18) and *The Crisis* was "mightily instrumental in buoying up the faith of his [Washington's] soldiers" (18). *Rights of Man* was a "beacon light" to lead people away from the old order of monarchy to the new one of democracy, a work which prompted the state, "like a cornered animal, in a spasm of rage . . . [to] lunge at the author, hoping to sink its venomous talons into his flesh" (16). Lastly, *The Age of Reason* was a "profoundly religious book," and Paine, far from being an atheist, believed God was "the greatest mechanic of creation" (16). Overlooking Paine's denial of Christian beliefs such as the divinity of Jesus, Calverton says Paine attacked established religion only when he

came to realize the ecclesiastics constituted a strong opponent to political reform and that the religion of humanity had been subverted by false doctrines. Paine could have concealed his views, but he was "too courageous to conceal his convictions in order to . . . win the favor of posterity" (17).

As Fascism continued its march in the 1930s, it would have been difficult for Americans to ignore Thomas Paine. In 1937 Israel Solemnick wrote in *Scholastic* that Paine was a man "Who 'Changed Men's Minds.'" Solemnick labels Paine "one of the most vigorous, courageous, and advanced thinkers of the eighteenth century" and a "tireless fighter in the battle for the freedom of mankind" (8). In *Rights of Man* he tried to illustrate the abuses and injustice of monarchy and yet, as a practical and humane person, he argued passionately for the life of Louis XVI. Paine produced *The Age of Reason* to defend the "true" religion of morality and humanity, but "fanaticism and bigotry joined hands with Federalism" to denounce "the great infidel" in America (9). Solemnick also praises Paine for his suggested reforms of society. The author concludes happily that the long "conspiracy of silence" against Paine has finally ended and now he is recognized as a hero of the Revolution and as a "great pioneer of progress" (21).

A short, unsigned piece, "Tom Paine, Patriot and Heretic," in *The Christian Century* in early 1937 combines Paine with Voltaire and suggests "Both men were ardently humanitarian. Both are misrepresented as legendary monsters of infidelity" (102). But, says the author, agreeing with Solemnick, Paine is no longer regarded as a despised infidel. However, the historian of intellectual and revolutionary movements, Crane Brinton, in "Paine on a Pedestal," in *Saturday Review of Literature*, disagrees with such a conclusion. He suggests that most Americans by the late thirties still have a negative opinion of Paine. Brinton thinks Paine deserves better recogni-

tion, even for *The Age of Reason*, an important work. Unfortunately for Paine, revolutionaries need to die young or become conservative, according to Brinton, in order not to lose favor with society. Paine did neither. His audience changed, though, and he fell from grace as a result.

During World War II writers tended to find most favor with Paine's political statements. Harry A. Tarr, associated with the Samuel J. Tilden High School of Brooklyn, New York, in "Builders of American Democracy," published in 1940, proclaims that *Common Sense* rallied the people to fight for their rights, and *The Crisis*, if read presently, should raise the courage of the "summer soldiers" and "sunshine patriots" of 1940 who doubt the survival of democracy and its eventual victory over aggression. And Max Eastman, a former leading American Socialist who became disillusioned with Soviet Russia, in "Crusader for Common Sense," discovers a Tom Paine who was against Fascism, for democracy, and who could do no wrong. He argues that Paine grasped the advantages of democracy over one-man rule. In his writings he obviously was denouncing dictatorship as much as he was monarchy when he proclaimed "Government by a single individual is vicious in itself" ("Anti-Monarchical Essay," Conway, III, 103). Later Paine declared in *Rights of Man* that it was time to end monarchy and aristocracy, and in reply the British government paid for the creation of a "scurrilous biography" (that of Francis Oldys) of Paine which started the decline of his reputation. However, *The Age of Reason* also contributed to the fall. Oversimplifying Paine's religious views once again, Eastman declares that no matter that Paine believed in God and simply raised questions about the quality of established churches and how literally one should view the Bible, churchmen felt they had to attack him by ostracism and slander. As a result, Paine died known as "a sot, a cheat,

a lecher, an exploiter of women and children, a blasphemer of God. The case has no parallel in the history of obloquy" (83-84). For Eastman and others during the reign of Nazi horror, Paine was a hero who was needed at the moment and who had to be resurrected, even if his saviors were putting him on a pedestal.

After World War II American writers in popular magazines continued to turn to Paine when crises developed. During the early stages of the Korean War, when the situation looked quite bleak for the United States, an unsigned piece in *Collier's* remarked that America was experiencing a "winter of discouragement" just as it had endured during the Revolution. Americans were pitched once again in a battle against tyranny; this time the enemy was Stalin rather than King George III, but that little mattered. The author notes that the people were just emerging from a period of "sunshine patriotism" in relation to the Korean conflict. The government was prepared to lead them to victory under steps that would "try our souls," but that is the price of freedom.

One should not be surprised that the McCarthy era produced some reference to Paine. The historian Henry S. Commager wrote a witty article in the mid-fifties for *The Saturday Review* in response to a refusal of Providence, Rhode Island, to erect a statue of Paine because he was "a controversial figure." Commager creates an imagined interview between Paine and the "Chairman of the Board" which rejected the statue. The Chairman questions Paine's loyalty to the United States because of his references to "The Republic of the World." The Chairman also points out that Paine had been known as "a radical, a revolutionary . . . in short a congenital subversive" (6). One other damaging accusation against Paine was that he supported the "welfare state" which would "weaken the moral fiber of the American people" (7). Paine tries to defend himself and in a quite poignant

concluding statement declares that “In my own lifetime, as you know, I was tried and imprisoned. But *these* are the times that try men’s souls” (32).

One may argue that by the mid-seventies Paine reached a fairly high level of respectability when an article dealing with him, Sam Adams, and Patrick Henry, “Firebrands of the American Revolution,” appeared in *National Geographic*. The author suggests that Paine’s writing ability was “a skill akin to magic” (Goldman, 22). In addition, he along with Henry, represented a side of the Revolution—the “attack on established classes and fixed ideas at home” (26)—that still lives today. Obviously, McCarthyism was in the grave and America had just experienced the sixties. Simultaneously, though, one of the few modern conservative writers to comment on Paine in a popular magazine did so in a review of David Hawke’s biography of Paine for *National Review*. The author, Aram Bakshian Jr., essayist, broadcaster, and director of speechwriting for President Ronald Reagan from 1981 through 1983, occasionally draws conclusions that are highly similar to the conservatives of the 18th and 19th centuries who originally denounced Paine. Bakshian declares that Paine magnified his role in the Revolution to “almost insane proportions” (1051) and, of course, he spent his last years “swilling cadged drinks” provided by “adoring Jeffersonians of the lower sort” (1052). However, Bakshian’s conservative reaction to Paine is most obvious when he compares him to “left wing Hollywood filmmakers in the 1940s who, temporarily discovering patriotism, turned out waves of incendiary propaganda films . . . and then lapsed back into their natural anti-Americanism” (1051). His writings may have contributed in some way to the success of the Revolution, according to Bakshian, but beyond that role Thomas Paine had few good qualities. For the conservative Bakshian, Paine’s ideas and actions are still too radical to give him a legitimate place in American history.

Liberals in recent years have continued to praise Paine and his ideas. In a 1979 issue of *The Humanist*, Sherley Ashton and Lloyd Morain stress that Paine's writings have not and should not be forgotten. *Common Sense* stirred the Americans to action; *Rights of Man* helped prepare the way for representative government; and *The Age of Reason* encouraged the rise of religious freedom by weakening religious superstition. Just a few years later Michael Foot, leader of the British Labor Party, reiterated in *Harpers* how it had taken generations to change the image of Paine, "to wipe away the mud." Foot notes that although some individuals still regard Paine as a crank, "a third-rate taproom philosopher," he is the "major prophet of democracy and representative government" (80). If anything proves the lasting value of Thomas Paine, says Foot, it is the endurance of his name while many of his critics have been long forgotten. "The man still lives" (82).

Whether liberal or conservative, many of the authors examined agree that Paine's *Common Sense* and *The Crisis* played a major role in the Revolution, a contribution generally recognized by high school and college texts today. Using those works and others some authors also found Paine's words to be relevant in a time of need to rally the American people against a foreign foe or to combat what they considered an internal enemy of the American way of life. In most cases, though, these authors have stressed his political writings. Only liberal writers—Conway, Calverton, Eastman, and their compatriots—have made an effort to persuade Americans that Paine was not the economic, social, and religious ogre that conservative writers claimed him to be. Motivated perhaps by their own liberalism, a progressively more liberal America, or by moments of crisis, these authors have struggled to make Paine's ideas more palatable. All authors who have written about Paine in a positive manner



have contributed to his resurrection over the past century. However, many of his reform programs probably will remain anathema to conservatives, and his religious views have little chance of being accepted by traditional Christians. Since Paine never became part of "the Establishment" as some of America's "sixties" radicals chose to do, his resurrection will never be complete.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alberger, John. "An Oration delivered at the Celebration in Philadelphia of the 106th Anniversary of the Birthday of Thomas Paine." *North American Review*, 57, July, 1843.
- "A Knight-Errant of Democracy." *The Freeman*, 7, June 13, 1923.
- "A Rehabilitation of Thomas Paine." *Current Literature*, 39, November, 1905.
- Ashton, Sherley and Morain, Lloyd. "Thomas Paine One of the Enduring Voices." *The Humanist*, 39, March, 1979.
- Ayer, A. J. *Thomas Paine*. New York: Atheneum, 1988.
- Bakshian, Jr., Aram. "A Pamphleteer and A Prince." *National Review*, 26, September 13, 1974.
- Bradford, Gamaliel. "Damaged Souls III: Thomas Paine." *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, 146, February 1923.
- Brinton, Crane. "Paine on a Pedestal." *Saturday Review of Literature*, 15, February 6, 1937.
- Calverton, Victor F. "Thomas Paine God-Intoxicated Revolutionary." *Scribner's Magazine*, 95, January, 1934.
- "Chronicle and Comment." *The Bookman*, 47, June, 1918.
- Commager, Henry Steele. "Tom Paine Talks Back to Providence." *The Saturday Review*, 26, December 24, 1955.
- Conway, Moncure D. "The Americanism of Thomas Paine." *Arena*, 21, February, 1899.
- Conway, Moncure D., ed. *The Writings of Thomas Paine*. 4 vols. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-96.
- Eastman, Max. "Tom Paine Crusader for Common Sense." *The Readers Digest*, 44, March, 1944.
- Foot, Michael. "Mr. Common Sense The American Trotsky." *Harpers*, 263, August, 1981.
- "Foreign Authors in America." *The Bookman*, 12, January, 1901.
- Goldman, Eric F. "Books That Changed America." *The Saturday Review*, July 4, 1953.
- . "Firebrands of the American Revolution." *National Geographic*, 146, July, 1974.
- Hart, Albert B. *National Ideals Historically Traced 1607-1907*. Vol. 26 of *The American Nation: A History*. Edited by Albert B. Hart. 28 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1904-18.
- Hawke, David. *Paine*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1974.
- Huett, Richard, ed. *Basic Writings of Thomas Paine*. New York: Willey Book Company, 1942.
- Ingersoll, Robert G. "Thomas Paine." *North American Review*, 155, August, 1892.
- Nevins, Allan. "Man of Reason With a Mission." *Saturday Review of Literature*, 26, May 1, 1943.
- Powell, Edward P. "Study of Thomas Paine." *Arena*, 8, November 1893.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. *Gouverneur Morris*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1898.

- Roper, R.C. "Citizen of the World." *The Public*, 22, March 15, 1919.
- . "Thomas Paine First to Urge League of Nations." *The Public*, 22, May 10, 1919.
- Seldes, Gilbert. "The Old Disbeliever." *The New Republic*, 52, September 21, 1927.
- "Sketch of the Life of Thomas Paine." *The Spirit of the Pilgrims*, 1, June, 1831.
- Solemnick, Israel. "Thomas Paine." *Scholastic*, 29, January 30, 1937.
- Tarr, Harry A. "Builders of American Democracy." *Scholastic*, 7, October 28, 1940.
- The Editor. "Tom Paine." *Catholic World*, 121, April, 1925.
- "The Price Is Not Too Great." *Colliers*, 127, January 27, 1951.
- "Thomas Paine in England and France." *The Atlantic Monthly*, 4, December, 1859.
- "Thomas Paine." *The Outlook*, 94, February 12, March 19, 1910.
- "Thomas Paine's Second Appearance in the United States." *The Atlantic Monthly*, 4, July, 1859.
- "Tom Paine, Patriot and Heretic." *The Christian Century*, 54, January 27, 1937.
- Van Tyne, Claude H. *The American Revolution 1776-1783*. Vol. 9 of *The American Nation: A History*. Edited by Albert B. Hart. 28 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1904-18.